



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,205	09/10/2003	Moon-Heui Lee	44630	3240

7590 12/27/2006  
Peter L. Kendall  
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
Suite 600  
1300 19th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER
----------

PHUONG, DAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/27/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/658,205

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Dai A. Phuong

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13, 17-19, 30-32 and 36-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13, 17-19, 30-32 and 36-38 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 10/11/2006, with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant had been selected group III on 04/26/2006, claims 11-13, 17-19, 30-32 and 36-52. Claims 11-13, 17-19, 30-32 and 36-52 are currently pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 39, 42, 44-46, 49 and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura (Pub. No: 20020094806) in view of in view of Sun (U.S. 6219410).

Regarding claim 39, Kamimura discloses a method of automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, the method comprising the steps of: inputting a phone number into a log deleting database of a telephone directory ([0039] to [0043] and [0045] to [0052]); storing the input phone number in the log deleting database ([0039] to [0043] and [0045] to [0052]); determining whether the input phone number is detected in an incoming or outgoing phone call ([0041] to [0043]). However,

Art Unit: 2617

Kamimura does not disclose preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call.

In the same field of endeavor, Sun discloses preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call (fig. 3, col. 5, lines 2-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the radio communication apparatus of Kamimura by specifically including preventing the input phone number from being displayed for the incoming or outgoing phone call, as taught by Sun, the motivation being in order to hide the number inputted from being display on a display such as telephone number as secret or privacy.

Regarding claim 42, the combination of Kamimura and Sun disclose all the limitations in claim 39. Further, Kamimura discloses the method further comprising: receiving voice mail associated with the input number in a private voice mailbox, the private voice mailbox being separate from the general mailbox ([0045] to [0052]).

Regarding claim 44, the combination of Kamimura and Sun disclose all the limitations in claim 39. Further, Kamimura discloses the method further comprising: associating at least one of a picture icon and distinctive ring with the input number detected in the incoming phone call ([0039] to [0041] and [0045] to [0052]).

Regarding claim 45, the combination of Kamimura and Sun disclose all the limitations in claim 39. Further, Kamimura discloses the method wherein the phone number is input using a keypad or a phonebook ([0039] to [0041] and [0045] to [0052]).

Regarding claim 46, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 39.

Regarding claim 49, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 42.

Regarding claim 51, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 44.

Regarding claim 52, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 45.

4. Claims 40-41, 43, 47-48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura (Pub. No: 20020094806) in view of Sun (U.S. 6219410) and further in view of Kumagai (Pub. No: 20020029246).

Regarding claim 40, the combination of Kamimura and Sun disclose all the limitations in claim 1. However, Kamimura does not disclose the method further comprising: selectively deleting the input phone number from a general call log or received number list if the input phone number is detected in the incoming or outgoing phone call.

In the same field of endeavor, Kumagai discloses the method further comprising: selectively deleting the input phone number from a general call log or received number list if the input phone number is detected in the incoming or outgoing phone call ([0072] to [0084]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the communication device of the combination of Kamimura and Sun by specifically including the method further comprising: selectively deleting the input phone number from a general call log or received number list if the input phone number is detected in the incoming or outgoing phone call, as taught by Kumagai, the motivation being in order to protect private information in the file access history.

Regarding claim 41, the combination of Kamimura and Sun and Kumagai disclose all the limitations in claim 40. Further, Kamimura discloses the method further comprising: displaying

a "no caller information" in the general call log or received number list if the input phone number is detected in the incoming or outgoing phone call (fig. 4, [0045] to [0061]).

Regarding claim 43, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 41.

Regarding claim 47, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 40.

Regarding claim 48, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 41.

Regarding claim 50, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 43.

#### **Reasons for Allowance**

5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowed:

Independent claims 11, 17, 30 and 36 are allowed.

Claims 12-13 are dependent on claim 11.

Claims 18-19 are dependent on claim 17.

Claims 31-32 are dependent on claim 30.

Claims 37-38 are dependent on claim 36.

Regarding claim 11, the prior art record fails anticipate or render obvious a method of automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, which comprises the steps of: inputting a telephone number; pressing a "send" key on the mobile phone; determining whether said input telephone number is present in a phonebook of the mobile phone; displaying said input telephone number on a display section of said mobile phone; *detecting telephone numbers stored in a log deleting management database; determining whether said input telephone number is included in the telephone numbers stored in the log deleting management database; recording said input telephone number, if said input telephone number is not present in the log deleting management*

*database, in a recently dialed number list; performing a dialing function; searching for a method of dialing said number, if said input telephone number is present in the log deleting management database; and performing a dialing function while concealing said input telephone number and a caller's name, if the method of dialing said number is caller concealment, all limitations combination as defined by applicant.*

Regarding claim 17, the prior art record fails anticipate or render obvious method of automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, which comprises the steps of: inputting a message and a telephone number and sending said input message and telephone number; reading telephone numbers stored in a log deleting management database; *determining whether said sent telephone number is included in the telephone numbers stored in the log deleting management database; recording said sent message and said sent telephone number in a sent message list; performing a message sending function if said sent telephone number is not present in the log deleting management database; determining whether said sent message and said telephone number should be recorded in a secret sent message list if said sent telephone number is present in the log deleting management database; recording said sent message and said sent telephone number in the secret sent message list, if said sent telephone number is present in the log deleting management database; and performing a message sending function for said sent message and sent telephone number, all limitations combination as defined by applicant.*

Regarding claim 30, the prior art record fails anticipate or render obvious a system for automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, the system comprising: an input, adapted to input a telephone number and

activate a "send" key on the mobile phone; and a controller, adapted to perform the following operations: determine whether said input telephone number is present in a phonebook of the mobile phone; display said input telephone number on a display section of said mobile phone; *detect telephone numbers stored in a log deleting management database; determine whether said input telephone number is included in the telephone numbers stored in the log deleting management database; record said input telephone number, if said input telephone number is not present in the log deleting management database, in a recently dialed number list; perform a dialing function; search for a method of dialing said number, if said input telephone number is present in the log deleting management database; and perform a dialing function while concealing said input telephone number and a caller's name, if the method of dialing said number is caller concealment*, all limitations combination as defined by applicant.

Regarding claim 36, the prior art record fails anticipate or render obvious a system for automatically deleting logged calls and messages in a mobile phone, in order to maintain security and protect privacy, the system comprising: a first mobile telephone and a second mobile phone; and said first mobile phone being adapted to perform the following operations: input a message and a telephone number; send said input message and telephone number to said second mobile phone; read telephone numbers stored in a log deleting management database; *determine whether said sent telephone number is included in the telephone numbers stored in the log deleting management database; record said sent message and said sent telephone number in a sent message list; perform a message sending function if said sent telephone number is not present in the log deleting management database; determine whether said sent message and said telephone number should be recorded in a secret sent message list if said sent telephone*



*number is present in the log deleting management database; record said sent message and said sent telephone number in the secret sent message list, if said sent telephone number is present in the log deleting management database; and perform a message sending function for said sent message and sent telephone number, all limitations combination as defined by applicant.*

### ***Response to Argument***

6. Applicant, on page 3 of his response, argues that since Groups I, II, and III are similar and recite common inventive features, again the Applicants believe that it will not be a serious burden on the Examiner to search and examine all of the claims. "If the search and examination of all claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine them on the merits, even though they claims to independent or distinction inventions. However, the Examiner disagrees. As the Examiner stated in the Office Action, 07/05/2006, that each group has different function or feature and requires different search area. For Example, group I discusses "to select a log deleting management database from a menu; inputting a password; displaying types of the log deleting management database if the input password is correct" which is about security, fraud prevention or authentication. Therefore, the search area of group I is in class 455 and subclass is 410. On the other hand, group II is discusses "determining whether a telephone number received with a voice call is stored in a phonebook; displaying said *received telephone number on a display section* of said mobile telephone" which is about message storage or retrieval or message notification. Therefore, The search area of group II is in class 455 and subclass is 412.1. While group III discusses "to input a telephone number; pressing a "send" key on the mobile phone;

Art Unit: 2617

determining whether said input telephone number is present in a phonebook of the mobile phone; displaying said input telephone number on a display section of said mobile phone" which is about call identification. Therefore, The search area of group III is in class 455 and subclass is 415. Finally, The Examiner believes that it will be a serious burden on the Examiner to search and examine all of the claims.

### Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dai A Phuong whose telephone number is 571-272-7896. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nguyen M Duc can be reached on 571-272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-7503.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dai Phuong  
AU: 2617  
Date: 12-14-2006



DUC M. NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600